

FOI Disclosures November 2020

Index

This month we have responded to questions relating to the following topics:

- [Former police officers in the IOPC](#)
- [Workers' disclosures under the Prescribed Persons \(Reports on Disclosures of Information\) Regulations 2017](#)
- [West Midlands Police Investigations](#)
- [Length of IOPC investigations](#)
- [Signatory of police complaint, appeal and review outcomes](#)
- [External training](#)
- [Operation Kalmia report](#)
- [Complaints regarding coronavirus fixed penalty notices](#)
- [Non procedural protection programs of victims and witnesses](#)
- [Operating system used in IOPC](#)
- [Investigation outcomes and prosecutions](#)

If you require a full copy of any of the embedded attachments, please contact Requestinfo@policeconduct.gov.uk quoting the reference number from the relevant response.

Ref 1008721 Back to top	<u>Former police officers in the IOPC</u>
<u>Request</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>How many former police officers (retired and ex warranted officers and not PCSOs) the IOPC have employed since its creation - each year if possible</i>2. <i>How many currently work for the IOPC</i>3. <i>What percentage of the workforce of the IOPC are they in relation to the answer to question number 2.</i>4. <i>If you do not employ former police officers the rational/strategic decision that states that.</i>
<u>Response</u>	<p>The total number of former police officers employed at IOPC/IPCC since we began operating The total number of former police officers employed at IOPC/IPCC since we began operating on 1 April 2004 is 314.</p> <p>While we hold data confirming the numbers recruited in each year we cannot extract this without carrying out significant additional work. We can consider this part of your request further if you so require; however, it is likely that the work involved in locating this data will exceed the FOIA cost limit, with the result that we may not be obliged to provide it.</p>

As to questions 2 and 3, data as to the career background of our staff is available on pages 11-15 of our most recent [staff diversity report](#) on our web site. Page 11 contains a table containing the numbers and percentages from March 2010 to March 2020. The current position (as at 2 November 2020) is that 136 former police officers are employed by the IOPC, which accounts for 13% of the work force.

There are a number of restrictions relating to the recruitment of former officers. By law, a person shall not be appointed as our Director General where they are or have been one of the 'restricted persons' listed in section 9(3) Police Reform Act 2002 (as amended by the Policing and Crime Act 2017). Restricted persons are persons who have previously worked as police officers or for a police service (under the direction and control of a chief officer), or as a National Crime Agency officer or for its predecessor organisations SOCA or NCIS.

The appointment of restricted persons to the IOPC is limited by our [Scheme of Delegation](#) and the [Director General's Policy Decision on employment of former police officers](#). Between them these documents confirm our approach to the delegation of 'designated functions' from the Director General to other persons at IOPC according to their position or seniority. Designated functions are defined in paragraph 6A of Schedule 2 Police Reform Act 2002.

Paragraphs 1.16 to 1.18 of the Policy Decision document confirm the Director General's decision on the appointment of restricted persons to our most senior roles. A restricted person shall not be appointed as Deputy Director General (Operations) or Deputy Director General (Strategy and Corporate Services). While there is no absolute restriction on the appointment of restricted persons as IOPC Executive Directors and Regional Directors, careful consideration will be given before allowing posts at this level to be held by a restricted person.

It should be noted that in setting out his policy, the Director General states: "There is no question that I value and respect the experience and skills that former police officers and staff bring to our organisation".

We check the Police Barred and Advisory lists when recruiting for less senior roles. The Police Barred list holds information on those who have been dismissed from the police service. Persons on this list cannot re-enter the police service or be employed by the IOPC. The Advisory list contains information on those who have resigned or retired whilst under investigation. An applicant's inclusion on this list is taken into account whenever we are recruiting for a role that can influence one of our investigations.

Additional restrictions have been imposed on the recruitment of former police officers to our Hillsborough investigation. On 19 December 2012 [a ministerial statement was laid in the House of Commons by the then Home Secretary, Theresa May](#). This stated:

	<p>“The IPCC and Jon Stoddart’s investigations will not employ officers or former officers with any prior connection to the Hillsborough disaster, nor who have worked in West Midlands, South Yorkshire or Merseyside police forces”.</p> <p>We apply these restrictions to appointments to our Hillsborough investigation team only.</p>
<p>Ref 1008675 Back to top</p>	<p><u>Workers’ disclosures under the Prescribed Persons (Reports on Disclosures of Information) Regulations 2017</u></p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many qualifying public interest disclosures did IOPC receive from the staff of the above police forces? 2. For the whole period, from 1 April 2018 to the present time, is it possible to give a broad breakdown of the types of concerns raised with the IOPC? 3. Does the IOPC keep a central record of how many disclosures are made anonymously? If so, please give the number of disclosures to IOPC as a prescribed person during the period 1 April 2018 to the present time 4. Does the IOPC hold central data on how it responded to disclosures, and if so, can it give a broad breakdown of how it responded to disclosures received in the period 1 April 2018 to the present time? 5. Does the IOPC have any policy and systems to protect whistle-blower staff who come forward to provide information about wrongdoing in police forces? If so, please advise of the details. 6. What is the IOPC’s approach to proven whistle-blower reprisal by any police force (whether proven by an Employment Tribunal or the IOPC’s own investigations)?
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>Our interpretation of your request is that you are seeking information about the “workers disclosures” on which the IOPC has or would have reported under The Prescribed Persons (Reports on Disclosures of Information) Regulations 2017. This requires that the IOPC, as a “relevant prescribed person”, must publish a report for the workers disclosures it has received during the 12 month period beginning on 1 April each year. As you may be aware the IOPC is the prescribed person for matters relating to the conduct of persons serving with the police and the other bodies to which our functions relate.</p> <p>The data on which we report under the Regulations relates to use of our report line, which exists for persons serving with the relevant bodies to report concerns of wrongdoing in their workplace.</p> <p>The majority of the concerns raised with the IOPC are about either corruption, discrimination or failures to investigate the concerns raised. We have various options for dealing with calls to our report line. The action we take will depend on the seriousness of the concerns raised, but we must obtain the reporter’s consent before passing any information to a police force.</p> <p>We have decided to release some aggregated data in response to your questions 1 to 4, as outlined below. This involves a very broad description of the nature of the complaint and the action taken. We have decided that releasing any more specific details, particularly of the nature of the complaints would be likely to result in the identification of individual reporters or related matters.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This information is presented below.

FORCE	2018 (fm 1/04/18)	2019	2020 (to 30/09/20)
Avon and Somerset		1	1
Bedfordshire		1	
BTP	2	2	
Cambridgeshire			
Cheshire	1		
City of London		2	
Civil Nuclear Police	2		
Cleveland	1	1	
Cumbria		1	
Derbyshire			
Devon and Cornwall	3		
Dorset	1		
Durham			
Dyfed-Powys		1	
Essex	1	2	
Gloucestershire		1	
Greater Manchester	1	4	
Gwent	1		
Hampshire			
Hertfordshire		2	
HMRC		1	
Humberside	3	1	
Kent			
Lancashire		1	1
Leicestershire	2		
Lincolnshire		1	
Merseyside	2		
Metropolitan Police	32	11	3
Ministry of Defence		2	1
Norfolk			
North Wales		1	1
North Yorkshire		1	1
Northamptonshire	1		
Northumbria	1		
Nottinghamshire			2
NCA		1	
South Wales	1		
South Yorkshire			
Staffordshire	1		
Suffolk	1	1	
Surrey	1	4	
Sussex		1	
Thames Valley			
UKBA		1	

Unknown	1	4	3
Warwickshire		2	
West Mercia		2	
West Midlands	3	2	
West Yorkshire		2	2
Wiltshire			
TOTAL	62	57	15

2. We have provided this aggregated data below. We have provided generalised and broad data regarding the type of concerns raised. This categorisation is based on a subjective decision made by IOPC staff according to the description given by the reporter. The categories are broadly construed but we have decided that we are unable to provide any more detailed data in response to this question because to do so may identify individuals who have reported their concerns.

Data is from 01/04/2018 to 30/09/2020			
2018			
CATEGORY	No.	ACTION TAKEN	No.
Bullying/ harassment	5	Consent requested / sent to force / advice given	61
Corrupt/ Improper practices	42	Intelligence report disseminated to force	1
Corruption	2		
Discrimination	7		
Failure to investigate	1		
Grievance/ employment	5		
2019			
CATEGORY	No.	ACTION TAKEN	No.
Abuse of powers	19	Consent requested / sent to force / advice given	57
Bullying /harassment	5		
Corrupt/improper practices	9		
Corruption	2		
Discrimination	1		
Failure to investigate	3		
general advice	1		
Grievance/employment	9		
Investigative practices	3		
Welfare	1		
Whistleblowing	1		
Unknown	3		
2020			
CATEGORY	No.	ACTION TAKEN	No.
Abuse of Powers	3	Consent requested / sent to force / advice given	15
Bullying and harassment	2		
Corrupt/ improper Practices	3		
Discrimination	1		
Grievance/employment	2		
Investigative practices	2		
Welfare	1		
Whistleblowing	1		

3. There have been four anonymous disclosures within this time frame.

	<p>4. We have provided aggregated data in response to this question above in the ‘ Action Taken’ table.</p> <p>5. We have a report line system that adheres to the Public Interest Disclosures Act and ensures that the anonymity of whistle-blowers is considered. Each case is assessed and considered on a case by case basis. Work is currently underway to establish a formal ‘Whistle-blower’s Policy’.</p> <p>6. There is no formal policy. Our approach to any such matters would be assessed and considered on a case by case basis.</p>
<p>Ref 1008740 Back to top</p>	<p><u>West Midlands Police Investigations</u></p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<p>Question 1: <i>In relation to a road traffic incident in Kingswinford that resulted in the death of four teenagers, you asked:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“...I would appreciate seeing a copy of the police report to the IOPC with minimal redactions to establish the extent of police involvement and if a pursuit of any kind was reported or implied.”</i></p> <p>Question 2: <i>In relation to the independent investigation following the death of Sean Fitzgerald you asked a number of questions as follows:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“Please advise what reference number the IOPC have allocated to the case and advise if the IOPC have completed their investigation of the incident”</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“...if it not yet completed, what is the estimated publication date and reason for the delay.”</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“Have the IOPC been officially advised that the Senior Officer ACC Sue Southern has retired, how was the information conveyed and who have WM Police nominated as the responsible officer for future correspondence in this case?”</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“As the deceased person was apparently unarmed, is there further legal process or hearings anticipated?”</i></p> <p>Question 3: <i>In relation to an investigation following the death of Trevor Smith, you asked the following:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“Please advise what reference number the IOPC have allocated to the Trevor Smith death enquiry”</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“...advise if the IOPC have completed their investigation of the incident and, if it not yet completed, what is the estimated publication date and reason for the delay.”</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“As the deceased person was apparently unarmed, is there further legal process or hearings anticipated?”</i></p>
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>Question 1</p> <p>You have specifically asked for information that would allow you to form an opinion on the circumstances of the incident. We understand this request to be for the description of the incident as contained in the initial referral form and</p>

	<p>supporting information sent to us by the police. As you are aware, this matter is subject to an independent investigation that is ongoing.</p> <p>We have decided to refuse your request because any information contained in the referral form that would fall in scope would engage exemptions under sections 30(1)(a)(i) and 40(2) of the FOIA. In the case of information falling within the exemption at section 30, we have decided that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs that in disclosure.</p> <p>We have published a statement announcing the investigation which can be found here and will publish updates at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Question 2</p> <p>The reference number is 2019/113838 and the investigation is ongoing.</p> <p>In line with our Publication Policy, a decision on publication of the final report will be made at the conclusion of the investigation, at the earliest point at which it is possible to rule out future external proceedings. You may wish to refer to our media statements regarding the progress of the case. The investigation is proceeding as expected given its complexity and is not considered to be delayed.</p> <p>Although ACC Southern made an announcement regarding this case on behalf of the force, she was not our point of contact regarding this investigation. Consequently there is no information held within the case file informing the IOPC that ACC Southern has retired. A senior officer within the Professional Standards Department has been nominated as our point of contact by the Appropriate Authority.</p> <p>As the investigation is ongoing it is not possible to comment at this time. The decision to share any information regarding legal process and hearings will lie with West Midlands Police.</p> <p>Question 3</p> <p>The reference number is 2019/116293.</p> <p>Our investigation has concluded but there are outstanding proceedings, as an inquest has been adjourned due to the Covid-19 pandemic. A decision regarding the publication of our report will be made in line with our Publication Policy. It is not possible to give a precise date. You may wish to refer to our media statements regarding this investigation.</p> <p>As explained, an inquest into the death has been adjourned. It is not possible to comment further at this time.</p>
<p><u>Ref</u> <u>1008720</u> Back to top</p>	<p><u>Length of IOPC investigations</u></p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<p><i>Details of the number of investigations into the police that have exceeded 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, 5 years and above since the 01/01/2010.</i></p>
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>The data below shows the number of completed investigations by year and duration. The data is based on the total number of independent investigations completed by the</p>

IOPC. Our combined independent investigations include core investigations which make up the majority of cases we investigate, and major investigations which are handled by a specialist team and are typically complex investigations into the most serious incidents, of significant public interest, requiring additional resources and often take longer to investigate. For the purpose of this request the data is ‘total investigations’.

		Independent Investigations completed (Incl. Major Investigations)									
Working Days	Years	2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
0-253	Less than 1 year	128	101	87	53	56	194	294	480	569	565
254-506	1-2 Years	25	16	15	26	51	42	129	185	105	90
507-759	2-3 Years	1	4	1	4	10	18	16	37	27	27
760-1012	3-4 Years	0	2	0	0	2	4	5	3	15	13
1013-1265	4-5 Years	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	22
1266+	5 Years +	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
		154	123	103	83	120	259	445	706	717	718

Caveat: Published figures may differ from this table due to a gap in duration recording. This impacts 2017/2018 (3 investigations) 2016/2017 (1 investigation), 2011/2012 (7 investigations).

You may find the IOPC annual statistics and monthly reporting against the IOPC Outcomes Framework, published on our [website](#) helpful, as well as our monthly [‘Roundup’](#) which includes performance information. It demonstrates key performance indicators and measure changes over time.

Ref
1008743
[Back to top](#)

Signatory of police complaint, appeal and review outcomes

Request

1. When a police complaint is appealed to IOPC, do you expect as per your policies and Regulations in Force, that the police complaint reply to Appellant -- contains an Approved Authority Person Secondary signature, in addition to the investigating officer signature?
2. Is the Approved Authority Secondary Signature upon a police complaint reply, required by any Regulation or Laws re formal police complaints? Please direct to these Regulations Laws?

Response

Our understanding of your request is that you are seeking confirmation of who is required by rules or procedure to sign correspondence confirming either the outcome of the investigation of a complaint, or the outcome of a subsequent appeal or review.

As regards decisions by the police, paragraphs 1.17 to 1.28 of our [Statutory Guidance](#) contain information about the delegation of the responsibilities of Appropriate Authorities (i.e. Chief Officers of police) and local policing bodies under the police complaints system. This includes decisions on appeals, reviews and complaint investigations. Paragraph 1.23 summarises the persons to whom the Chief Officer can delegate their responsibilities in respect of police complaints. There are no requirements relating to the inclusion of any particular signatures in correspondence from the police conveying decisions on complaints, appeals or reviews.

When it is acting as the Relevant Appeal Body or Relevant Review Body, the IOPC confirms the identity of the person who decided the appeal or review in its decision

letter to the complainant. There are no rules requiring the inclusion of the signature(s) of any particular IOPC job holders in this correspondence.

While the IOPC's decision making powers are formally conferred on the Director General, the legislation (specifically paragraph 6A of Schedule 2 Police Reform Act 2002) allows him to delegate some of his statutory functions to IOPC staff. Functions relating to appeal and review decisions are delegated to IOPC staff in accordance with the principles under parts 9 and 10 (pages 4 to 5) of the IOPC Scheme of Delegation.

Therefore we do not hold any information on the subject of who is required by rules or procedure to sign correspondence confirming either the outcome of the investigation of a complaint, or the outcome of a subsequent appeal or review.

<u>Ref</u> <u>1008694</u> Back to top	<u>External training</u>
---	---------------------------------

<u>Request</u>	<i>You asked a number of questions regarding external training</i>
-----------------------	--

<u>Response</u>	<p><i>External training spend in the previous 3 fiscal years (2017/18, 2018/19, 2019/20) in the Independent Office for Police Conduct, broken down by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Amount spent through the Civil Service Learning contract and amount spent to deliver external training through other contracts:</i> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Total £k</th> <th>Total CSL £k</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>17-18</td> <td>900</td> <td>120,935</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18-19</td> <td>949</td> <td>71,716</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19-20</td> <td>649</td> <td>27,037</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Under the Civil Service Learning Contract –Amount spent on online/digital delivery versus amount spent on in-person delivery</i> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Period between 1/4/2017 to 01/10/2020:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Delivery Type</th> <th>Total costs £k</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Digital only</td> <td>912</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In person only sessions</td> <td>71,826</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Blended with in-person session/s</td> <td>146,950</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Amount of spend allocated for bespoke courses specifically developed for your needs and amount of spend allocated for 'off-the-shelf' training material</i> <p>This information is not held.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Breakdown of the 2019/20 external training spend through the CSL contract in the Independent Office for Police Conduct by course, including :Total amount spent per course</i> <p>The following is based on the most up to date information available.</p>	Year	Total £k	Total CSL £k	17-18	900	120,935	18-19	949	71,716	19-20	649	27,037	Delivery Type	Total costs £k	Digital only	912	In person only sessions	71,826	Blended with in-person session/s	146,950
Year	Total £k	Total CSL £k																			
17-18	900	120,935																			
18-19	949	71,716																			
19-20	649	27,037																			
Delivery Type	Total costs £k																				
Digital only	912																				
In person only sessions	71,826																				
Blended with in-person session/s	146,950																				

Topic Name	Cancellation fees	Fees (attendees)	Fees (empty seats)	Fees (no attendance data)	Total
PRINCE2 2017 foundation and practitioner	£1,251	£6,255	£0	£0	£7,506
Assertiveness	£0	£1,448	£1,448	£0	£2,896
Presenting confidently	£0	£2,080	£416	£0	£2,496
Leading career conversations with a growth mind set	£2,112	£0	£0	£0	£2,112
Coaching and mentoring: ILM qualification (Level 5) - GL1	£0	£1,630	£326	£0	£1,956
Coaching and mentoring: ILM qualification (Level 5) - GL2	£0	£1,304	£652	£0	£1,956
Coaching and mentoring: ILM qualification (Level 5) - module 2	£0	£1,793	£163	£0	£1,956
Coaching and mentoring: ILM qualification (Level 5) - module 3	£0	£1,793	£163	£0	£1,956
Coaching and mentoring: ILM qualification (Level 5) - module 4	£0	£1,467	£489	£0	£1,956
APM Project Management Qualification	£1,213	£0	£0	£0	£1,213
Success profiles – sifting and interviewing (online and workshop)	£0	£996	£0	£0	£996
First aid annual refresher	£38	£0	£0	£0	£38
Agile Project Management Foundation	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Agile Project Management foundation and practitioner	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Communicating Policy Effectively	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Resilience and wellbeing	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Total	£4,614	£18,766	£3,657	£0	£27,037

- Total number of learners per course
- Training provider that delivered the course
- Course delivery method – i.e. online/digital or in-person
- Name of course and Subject area of course

Please see the table below, the data is only provided for courses that were delivered and is based on the most up to date information available.

Date(s)	Course	Learners	Training Supplier	Delivery Method	Curriculum area
24/06/2019	First Aid At Work	48	Red Cross Society	F2F	Capability Building
10/07/2019	Coaching and Mentoring: ILM Qual (L5) Module 2	11	Elisha Training Ltd	Blended inc. F2F	Leadership and Management
11/07/2019	Coaching and Mentoring: ILM Qual (L5) Module 3	11	Elisha Training Ltd	Blended inc. F2F	Leadership and Management
10/09/2019	Presenting Confidently	10	Elisha Training Ltd	Blended inc. F2F	Leadership and Management
26/09/2019	Assertiveness	8	Elisha Training Ltd	Blended inc. F2F	Leadership and Management
16/10/2019	Coaching and Mentoring: ILM Qual (L5) GL1	10	Elisha Training Ltd	Blended inc. F2F	Leadership and Management
10/12/2019	Coaching and Mentoring: ILM Qual (L5) Module 4	9	Elisha Training Ltd	Blended inc. F2F	Leadership and Management
03/02/2020, 24/02/2020, 09/03/2020	Prince2 2017 Foundation and Practitioner	6	CITI Ltd	Blended inc. F2F	Project Delivery
04/02/2020	Coaching and Mentoring: ILM Qual (L5) GL2	8	Elisha Training Ltd	Blended inc. F2F	Leadership and Management
27/02/2020, 05/03/2020	Success Profiles Sifting and interviewing (online and workshop)	4	CITI Ltd	Blended inc. F2F	Leadership and Management

External training budget for 2020/21 fiscal year in the Independent Office for Police Conduct, broken down by:

- *Budget to spend through the Civil Service Learning contract and budget to spend on the delivery of external training through other contracts.*

Year	External £k	CSL £k
20-21 Budget	584	45k

- *Any analysis undertaken on how your department's training needs have shifted this year compared to previous years. For example, are you planning greater emphasis on Leadership & Management courses or training delivered through digital/online courses?*

Learning needs analysis is conducted through multiple methods, collecting data from business partnering conversations, business planning and horizon scanning. The emphasis for L&D each year is informed by the strategic priorities of the business. Quite often, there are occasions when annual plans need to be adjusted to respond to the needs of the business. This year, the redevelopment of class room content into content that can be delivered remotely (including developing digital content for our LMS) as well as supporting colleagues to work remotely have been our focus.

Total number of civil service employees working in the Independent Office for Police Conduct (please provide latest available data).

IOPC employees are not civil servants; however our employee headcount was 1032 on 31 March 2020.

Ref
1008748

[Back to top](#)

Operation Kalmia report

Request

A copy of the Operation Kalmia investigation report.

Response

The IPCC (as we were known before we became the IOPC) published a significant amount of information about Operation Kalmia on its web site, including redacted and summary versions of the report. This information is available on The National Archive web site [here](#). If you experience any difficulty in accessing this content please let us know.

In addition, a redacted version of the related Management Review Report (often referred to as the 'Costello report') was disclosed by Staffordshire Police on 3 May 2017 and is available [on this web page](#).

The redacted version of the Kalmia report was published by the IPCC following a Freedom of Information request. Our approach to redaction was supported by the Information Commissioner in her decision notice, which is available [here](#) on the ICO web site. Should the IOPC receive a new request under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) for the same information we would refuse the information we have not already published in reference to the reasons for refusal in the Commissioner's decision notice.

<p>Ref 1008752 Back to top</p>	<p><u>Complaints regarding coronavirus fixed penalty notices</u></p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>How many complaints has the IOPC received about fixed penalty notices issued by police for breaches of coronavirus regulations?</i> 2. <i>For each complaint listed in your answer to question 1, could you state which police force it was made against and, if it is within the time/cost limit of the FOI Act, provide a brief summary of each complaint?</i> 3. <i>For each complaint, could you state whether it was investigated by the IOPC and the outcome of the investigation?</i>
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>The IOPC does not hold this information. This is because complaints are recorded by the police force concerned in the first instance and the vast majority of complaints are then completed by the police without any IOPC involvement. Annual complaints statistics are collated by the IOPC for each police force, data pertaining to 2020 is not yet available. Significant system changes due to legislative change to the complaints system, introduced in February 2020 has delayed the regular quarterly reporting we undertake. However, these changes included additional recording mechanisms to capture complaints relating to COVID-19 and data is expected for publication in early 2021. For more information about our functions please see our web site.</p> <p>While we cannot provide the data you require, we can provide some information about incidents that have been referred to us by the police. The criteria for referral of a complaint, conduct matter or death or serious injury matter are designed to capture the most serious and sensitive incidents and so would be unlikely to include complaints involving the issue of Fixed Penalty Notices unless other factors were present at the same time. For more information about the referral process, including the different ‘triggers’ for a referral to the IOPC, please see Chapter 9 of our Statutory Guidance.</p> <p>Finding examples of complaints that may meet the terms of your request would require a manual trawl of all potentially relevant referrals. Please let us know if you would like us to carry out this search. We could only provide examples of complaints about coronavirus FPNs and would not be able to locate all such complaints notified to the IOPC without a very extensive manual search of all of our case types including appeals, reviews and referrals. A search aimed at producing comprehensive data would be very likely to exceed the cost limit under section 12 of the FOIA even if we were to focus on referrals only.</p> <p>The IOPC has not commenced an investigation of its own relating to complaints of this type.</p> <p>You may find the latest College of Policing Brief to be helpful. Pages 30-32 contain an analysis of Coronavirus fines.</p>
<p>Ref 1008753 Back to top</p>	<p><u>Non procedural protection programs of victims and witnesses</u></p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<p><i>Grounds, procedure and any other publicly available information about non-procedural protection programs or systems of victims and witnesses during your investigation.</i></p>
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>The IOPC does not provide victim or witness non-procedural protection services independently from other government agencies.</p>

	<p>The steps that we take to support vulnerable witnesses or victims are defined in our safeguarding policies and the guidance contained in our Operations Manual (OM), which contains all of the guidance required for us to carry out our operational work.</p> <p>Please find attached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguarding policy statement for protecting children and young people • Safeguarding policy statement for protecting adults and young children at risk • OM guidance – Referral to victim support • OM guidance - Significant, vulnerable and intimidated witness policy • OM guidance – Victims Code • OM guidance – Survivor Engagement Team <p>Our Learning the Lessons (LTL) magazine helps the police to improve policy and practice based upon the findings of our investigations. LTL learning report 32.3 may be of interest to you because it relates to the protection of vulnerable people and includes recommendations concerning Domestic Violence Protection Notices.</p>
<p><u>Ref</u> <u>1008776</u> Back to top</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Operating system used in IOPC</u></p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<p><i>Could you please provide a list of the most popular operating systems used in the department?</i></p>
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>Microsoft Windows 10 is by far the most common operating system in use by the IOPC.</p>
<p><u>Ref</u> <u>1008523</u> Back to top</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Investigation outcomes and prosecutions</u></p>
<p><u>Request</u></p>	<p><i>1. Since the IOPC's inception, what is the total number of cases that have been investigated?</i></p> <p><i>2. You asked: "Out of those cases how many and files have been passed to the CPS for Criminal Investigation? and How many of those referred cases have resulted in Criminal Charges?"</i></p> <p><i>3. Out of those charges - how many of them relate to cases of Death in Custody or Death Following Police Conduct?</i></p> <p><i>4. Finally how many of those charges have resulted in conviction.</i></p>
<p><u>Response</u></p>	<p>1. The IOPC was officially incepted in January 2018. Prior to this we were known as the IPCC. On 29 October you clarified that you required IPCC data as well as IOPC data.</p> <p>We produce a regular annual report which sets out the number of referrals received, the total number of investigations completed per year, along with other related data, which can be found on our website. The current Annual Report can be found here. Previous Annual Reports can be found via this page.</p>

The recording of investigations outcomes in a reportable format was introduced in 2015, records relating to cases prior to that date would require a manual data trawl to extract the outcomes data you are seeking. Such activities would involve scrutiny of hundreds of cases with the result that this would far exceed the cost limit of 18 hours prescribed by section 12 of the FOIA and associated Regulations.

Data has therefore been provided for the period between 1 April 2015 to 17 November 2020.

This information is recorded at subject level (the officer or police staff under investigation) rather than case level. All dates referred to below are for the period the investigation was completed. Proceedings may have taken place outside of this period.

In the period 1 April 2015 to 17 November 2020, the IOPC completed 3,138 independent investigations.

2. Referrals to the CPS are made in relation to allegations against an individual, not a case. Multiple individuals may be associated with one case. The threshold for referral by the IOPC differs to that used by the CPS to decide whether it is appropriate for criminal prosecution.

Of the 3,787 subjects for which we have information recorded, 432 were referred to the CPS for decision regarding prosecution. Of these, the CPS decided to prosecute 77 individuals.

3. By '*death following police conduct*' we are assuming you are referring to death following police contact. To obtain this information we cross referenced the data collected for our [annual deaths statistics report](#). To produce the annual death statistics, the circumstances of all deaths referred to the IOPC / IPCC are examined to determine whether they meet the criteria for inclusion in the categories. Further information regarding the death category definitions '*death in custody*' and '*other deaths following police contact – IPCC/IOPC investigations*' can be found on our [website](#).

Of the 77 individuals prosecuted, three were related to a case involving '*death in custody*' or '*other death following police contact*.'

4. Of the 77 individuals the CPS charged with a criminal offence, trial verdicts are presently recorded for 65 individuals, 26 of which resulted in a guilty verdict.

Information used in this FOIA response relating to the outcomes of investigations, including referrals to the CPS and subsequent prosecutions, have been taken from an operational case management system which is subject to regular case updates. The IOPC are due to publish on our website annual statistics on the outcomes of our investigations from April 2021, with some data being made available early in the New Year.

